

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

106th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 315

October 6, 1999, 4:56 p.m.
Page S-12089 Temp. Record

LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION/Advance Funding to Train Teachers

SUBJECT: Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2000 . . . S. 1650. Specter motion to table the Kennedy amendment No. 1819.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 56-43

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. 1650, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2000, will provide \$324.2 billion in new budget authority, which is \$22.531 billion more than provided in fiscal year (FY) 1999 and is \$911.0 million less than requested. This amount includes advance discretionary and mandatory appropriations and \$9.902 billion in spending from trust funds. Budget authority for fiscal year 2000 discretionary spending will total \$84.018 billion.

The Kennedy amendment would add \$220 million in advance appropriations for FY 2001 for Teacher Quality Enhancement grants.

Debate was limited by unanimous consent. After debate, Senator Specter moved to table the Kennedy amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

This education proposal is less objectionable than some of the other education proposals that have been put forward on this bill because there is at least some valid empirical evidence that improving teacher quality improves student performance. However, the Teacher Quality Enhancement Program did not even exist until last year, when it was funded at \$77 million. This bill will increase the program's funding to \$80 million. Our colleagues now say that is not enough; they have decided that we ought to quadruple funding for this new program. They have suggested using advance appropriations, which conveniently relieve them of having to worry about this year's spending caps. It is all the joy of spending with none of the worry of how to pay the bill. We will not join

(See other side)

YEAS (56)			NAYS (43)		NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans (54 or 100%)	Democrats (2 or 4%)		Republicans (0 or 0%)	Democrats (43 or 96%)	Republicans (1)	Democrats (0)
Abraham	Helms	Conrad		Akaka		
Allard	Hutchinson	Feingold		Baucus		McCain- ²
Ashcroft	Hutchison			Bayh		
Bennett	Inhofe			Biden		
Bond	Jeffords			Bingaman		
Brownback	Kyl			Boxer		
Bunning	Lott			Breaux		
Burns	Lugar			Bryan		
Campbell	Mack			Byrd		
Chafee	McConnell			Cleland		
Cochran	Murkowski			Daschle		
Collins	Nickles			Dodd		
Coverdell	Roberts			Dorgan		
Craig	Roth			Durbin		
Crapo	Santorum			Edwards		
DeWine	Sessions			Feinstein		
Domenici	Shelby			Graham		
Enzi	Smith, Bob (I)			Harkin		
Fitzgerald	Smith, Gordon			Hollings		
Frist	Snowe			Inouye		
Gorton	Specter			Johnson		
Gramm	Stevens			Kennedy		
Grams	Thomas					
Grassley	Thompson					
Gregg	Thurmond					
Hagel	Voinovich					
Hatch	Warner					

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

our colleagues on this irresponsible spending spree. This bill already contains such a large increase in funding that support for it from conservative Senators is lukewarm at best; adding more spending will jeopardize its passage. For education, we note that we have already increased this year's spending by \$2.3 billion, which is a larger increase than requested by the President. Most of that increase will be spent on existing Federal education commitments that are being underfunded. We understand that many Democrats would rather have this bill spend that extra \$2.3 billion on their new education ideas instead, but they still should be pleased that we have been able to come up with this much extra funding. They should quit trying to load the bill down with new spending ideas, because every time they succeed in adding more spending they make it less likely the bill will pass at all. The Kennedy amendment to quadruple funding for this brand new program, in sum, is not a responsible proposal. We urge our colleagues to reject it.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

Several excellent suggestions have been made during this debate to improve public education. The Senate has considered proposals to fund afterschool programs, to hire teachers, and to improve school facilities. The Kennedy amendment would take another approach which is equally meritorious. It would provide funding to give teachers additional training in order to make them more effective teachers. This idea has broad, bipartisan support in the Senate. Unfortunately, it is not receiving a great deal of funding. The Kennedy amendment would remedy that problem by bringing funding for the Teacher Quality Enhancement Program up to its fully authorized level of \$300 million. We urge our colleagues to support this amendment.